

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-20, 22, 23, 25-26, 28 and 31-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 30, 2007.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanner, *et al.* (US 2002/0038451) in view of Gadre (US 2005/00556681). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. In particular, it is noted that the filing date of Gadre is September 8, 2003 while the filing date of the subject application is January 29, 2004. It is also noted that the subject matter of Gadre and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) would not be proper pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(c). In view of at least the foregoing, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 13-20 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanner, *et al.* (US 2002/0038451) in view of Burd, *et al.* (US 6,961,750 B1) and further in view of Gadre (US 2005/00556681). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. In particular, it is noted that the filing date of Gadre is September 8, 2003 while the filing date of the subject application is January 29, 2004. It is also noted that the subject matter of Gadre and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) would not be proper pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(c). In view of at least the foregoing, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 23 and 25-26, 28, 31-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 23 and 25-26, 28, 31-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanner, *et al.* (US 2002/0038451) in view of Goodwin, *et al.* (US 6,199,195). Regarding rejection of claims 30-39, it is indicated that these claims are rejected over Tanner, *et al.* in view of Goodwin, *et al.* (US 6,199,195). However, the detailed rejections of claims 32-39 recite sections from Burd, *et al.* without any reference to Goodwin, *et al.* (*See* pages 8-9 of the subject Final Office Action). Hence, it is presumed that the Examiner intended these claims to be rejected over Tanner, *et al.* in view of Goodwin, *et al.* and further in view of Burd, *et al.* Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited documents either alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all features of the claimed subject matter.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to an application development framework, and more particularly, to a framework that provides an access point to commonly used building blocks. To this end, independent claims 23, 28 and 31 recite similar features namely: ***searching the source code for one or more of the objects; collecting the one or more objects that are found; and compiling the one or more objects that are associated with a given property, into the class.*** As stated on page 7 of the subject Final Office Action, Tanner, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest searching the source code for a class of objects that are associated with a property, identifying the objects and compiling the objects into a class. The secondary documents Goodwin, *et al.* and Burd, *et al.* fail to make up for such deficiencies of Tanner, *et al.* In particular, it is erroneously contended on page 7 of the subject Final Office Action that Goodwin, *et al.* teaches the step of compiling the one or more objects associated with a given property into a class. Rather, Goodwin, *et al.* relates to generating source code objects by using a plurality of logical models which models were generated by using a plurality of modeling tools. A system comprising templates associated with the services of the framework is also generated. The source code objects within the system are generated as functions of the templates and the models. In this context, Goodwin, *et al.* discloses objects that map to data resources within an enterprise and allow clients to query against these objects, and at runtime, ***to have results returned as objects.*** Hence, Goodwin, *et al.* teaches querying objects and having the results of the query returned as objects (*See* Goodwin, *et al.* col.7 lines 46-50). This is different from the subject claims which allow objects that are associated with a specific property within source code to be identified and compiled into a class. Hence, unlike Goodwin, *et al.* which queries data sources

by employing objects, the claimed subject matter pertains to querying the source code for objects belonging to a class. This facilitates a developer of an application to easily locate frequently used classes within a framework since such classes are compiled into separate group classes and provided in a namespace. Burd, *et al.* fail to make up for such deficiencies of Tanner, *et al.* and Goodwin, *et al.* In particular, Burd, *et al.* relates to a server-side control object that processes and generates a client-side user interface element for display on a web page and does not teach or suggest collection source code objects into a class as recited in the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to independent claims 23, 28, 31 and all the claims that depend there from.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP580US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731